

REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 31 December 2001 with twenty one claims, four of which were written in independent form. Claim 16 has been allowed.

Claim 17 was objected to as the dependency was omitted. Claim 17 has been amended to overcome this objection.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,490,868 B1 to Bunce et al. ("Bunce"), or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bunce alone or taken in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,604,361 to Isaksson ("Isaksson"). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Amended Claim 1 recites, "a ball . . . a socket . . . and a collar . . . having at least three springs located symmetrically about the opening which contact the ball such that the ball may pivot but is relatively fixed translationally." Bunce alone or taken in view of Isaksson does not show, teach, or suggest these limitations.

Claims 2-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bunce or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bunce alone or taken in view of Isaksson. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 2-15 depend from Claim 1 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own limits. For the reasons argued above with respect to Claim 1, the prior art of record does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of the base claim, much less the limitations of the base claim in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bunce or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bunce alone or taken in view of Isaksson. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 18 recites, "A method . . . comprising: . . . placing the ball into a socket . . . fastening a collar . . . having at least three springs that are mechanically biased symmetrically around and against the ball . . . and . . . affixing the springs to the ball." Bunce alone or taken in view of Isaksson does not show, teach, or suggest these limitations.

Claims 19-21 depend from Claim 18 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own limits. For the reasons argued above with respect to Claim 18, the prior art of

record does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of the base claim, much less the limitations of the base claim in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

Newly added Claims 22-28 are similar to original claims 2, 4, 6-9, 13, and 14. Newly added Claims 22-28 depend from Claim 16 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418